

Message

---

**From:** Mutter, Andrew [mutter.andrew@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 12/7/2019 1:00:56 AM  
**To:** Partridge, Charles [Partridge.Charles@epa.gov]; Wall, Dan [wall.dan@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium Study and Board of Health Meeting

Thx Charlie

Best regards,

Andrew

**Andrew Mutter**

Director, Public Affairs  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 (Denver, CO)

Office: 303.312.6448  
Cell: 720.520.3047

Twitter: [@EPARegion8](#)  
Facebook: [U.S. EPA Region 8](#)  
Webpage: EPA Region 8 (Mountains and Plains)

---

**From:** Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 6, 2019 5:08 PM  
**To:** Mutter, Andrew <mutter.andrew@epa.gov>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium Study and Board of Health Meeting

The following website has an online calculator to easily check your conversions

<https://www.rapidtables.com/convert/number/ppb-to-ppm.html>

His conversion is correct and I suggest he use it to check his calculation

Cp

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 6, 2019, at 4:23 PM, Mutter, Andrew <[mutter.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:mutter.andrew@epa.gov)> wrote:

**Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 6, 2019, at 4:12 PM, Wall, Dan <[wall.dan@epa.gov](mailto:wall.dan@epa.gov)> wrote:

Andrew, I have not had a chance to read the Canada study but speaking with Charlie and others this is the crux of why the health agencies are so concerned with the Hailer McDermott study. The conclusion of CDC was the infants in Columbia are malnourished. I think it is good that Matt has figured this out on his own and he should keep asking questions without our involvement. Your response is fine by me.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 6, 2019, at 3:55 PM, Mutter, Andrew  
<[mutter.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:mutter.andrew@epa.gov)> wrote:

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Best regards,

Andrew

**Andrew Mutter**

Director, Public Affairs  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 (Denver, CO)

Office: 303.312.6448  
Cell: 720.520.3047

Twitter: [@EPARegion8](https://twitter.com/EPARegion8)  
Facebook: [U.S. EPA Region 8](https://www.facebook.com/USEPARegion8)  
Webpage: EPA Region 8 (Mountains and Plains)

**From:** Matt Vincent <[matt@rampart-solutions.com](mailto:matt@rampart-solutions.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 6, 2019 3:49 PM  
**To:** Mutter, Andrew <[mutter.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:mutter.andrew@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium Study and Board of Health Meeting

Thank you! I have one more question. Since Charlie sent the Canada studies he was referring to at the Board of health Meeting (Arbuckle/Ettinger), I've had a chance to review them in some level of detail. Best I can tell, the Canada studies provide a baseline look at metals levels in general populations (e.g. non-mining) in 10 cities across Canada. Manganese is the only metal that is the same as what Hailer and McDermott looked at in their study relative to meconium levels. If I read the data correctly in the Arbuckle study it is 4.9 ug/g, which needs to be multiplied by 1,000 to get to the PPB levels used in Hailer/McDermott. This means that the mean in the Arbuckle study (4,900 ppb) is not much lower, or relatively close (1.09) to being the same as the concentrations in Hailer/McDermott for Butte meconium, which was 5,346 ppb. Assuming I did these calculations correctly, why is this not being mentioned or the focus of the findings? Furthermore,

why are the South Carolina mean levels of Mn (3.25) so low? I am going to pose these same questions to Dr. Hailer and see what she says.

Thanks again,  
Matt

On Fri, Dec 6, 2019 at 3:08 PM Mutter, Andrew  
<[mutter.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:mutter.andrew@epa.gov)> wrote:

Great. Will have you something my 5 pm today.

Best regards,

Andrew

***Andrew Mutter***

Director, Public Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 (Denver, CO)

Office: 303.312.6448

Cell: 720.520.3047

Twitter: [@EPARegion8](https://twitter.com/EPARegion8)

Facebook: [U.S. EPA Region 8](https://www.facebook.com/USEPARegion8)

Webpage: EPA Region 8 (Mountains and Plains)

---

**From:** Matt Vincent <[matt@rampart-solutions.com](mailto:matt@rampart-solutions.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, December 6, 2019 3:08 PM

**To:** Mutter, Andrew <[mutter.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:mutter.andrew@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium Study and Board of Health Meeting

Absolutely, Andrew. I received an extension on my story deadline so I could incorporate your responses.

Thanks!

Matt

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 6, 2019, at 2:57 PM, Mutter, Andrew  
<[mutter.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:mutter.andrew@epa.gov)> wrote:

Matt,

Will 4 or 5 today work for our responses?

Best regards,

Andrew

***Andrew Mutter***

Director, Public Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8  
(Denver, CO)

Office: 303.312.6448

Cell: 720.520.3047

Twitter: [@EPARegion8](https://twitter.com/EPARegion8)

Facebook: [U.S. EPA Region 8](https://www.facebook.com/USEPARegion8)

Webpage: EPA Region 8 (Mountains and Plains)

**From:** Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 5, 2019 6:09 PM  
**To:** Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>;  
Mutter, Andrew <mutter.andrew@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium  
Study and Board of Health Meeting

Hi Charlie,

Thanks for the conversation today. As we discussed, I am writing a story for the Butte Weekly, which will be published next Wednesday. My deadline for submittal is close of business tomorrow, so I would very much appreciate your responses sooner than later.

Please let me know via email or call if you have any clarifying questions or need anything else. Again, I really appreciate it!

Matt

1. I felt that Dr. Hailer kind of put you on the spot in the meeting when she mentioned she'd already showed you her meconium data back in March 2019 and asked you to clarify what your change in response was to the same data now that it's in her report and now that it's published. Can you give me an official statement as your answer to that question, and would you care to clarify for the record the details of that March 2019 meeting?

2. More relevant, now that the data is published with references, and has appeared on the front page of the daily newspaper, causing quite a stir, what is your detailed plan for next steps and a timeframe to complete it? E.G. In your estimation, how long will it take for EPA to conclude from Hailer/McDermott's raw data and additional samples whether we have an issue that needs further attention?

3. Relative to what you said at the Board of Health meeting about running remaining samples "blind" at an EPA, CDC or independent laboratory, which Katie confirmed there were remaining meconium samples; and her offer to go through in excruciating detail her

methods, raw data, etc. -- Have you confirmed that she will send you her (and McDermott's) leftover splits and have you received or officially requested the study's raw data?

4. Hailer made a very confident statement that she/McDermott had looked through all of their methods, data, etc. and ultimately concluded "No: we didn't make any mistakes." You made a number of statements that clearly indicated a need for EPA to "confirm", "looking at the study further" "delving into the data much deeper" and even went so far as saying "if the Butte data holds up" "if these (data) turnout."

What are the main things you are looking at in the data and what do you make of Hailer's comment that there were no mistakes made?

5. Hailer and McDermott say in their study's published conclusion that their approach "provided straightforward evidence of elevated exposure to metals in a mining exposed community. The approach was inexpensive, thorough and required no advanced statistical analysis." Further they used the term "potential public health emergency." What is your reaction and assessment to these conclusions.

6. Please explain your experience in toxicology and with EPA and in that experience, what is your assessment/comparison of this particular "pilot" "proof of concept" study and how it is being amplified versus any other examples you've worked with or are aware of?

7. You mentioned a study from Canada as the "gold standard" of meconium studies, which used >2,000 samples and as relevant study you are looking to for appropriate comparisons. Can you please send that to me and perhaps give me a reason why you hold it in higher regard to the other studies referenced in Hailer's study and in her presentation/comparisons?

8. Do you know anything about the NIH grant proposal Hailer/McDermott submitted and why it was unsuccessful?

9. Please feel free to add anything else, any other statements that you would like me to include in the story. Again, don't hesitate to call or email me if you have additional questions. Thanks again!